

Mr. Tepper says that feeling drew him close to the blacks he met while attending Rutgers University on a football scholarship. His determination to bridge racial gaps, fed in part by his active Christianity, grew during the 24 years he spent as an assistant coach at a half-dozen schools before Illinois promoted him to head coach from defensive coordinator in late 1991. "My wife, Karen, and I told ourselves that if I ever got a top job, we'd make it reflect our views about how people should be treated," he says.

Those views are contained in a "mission statement" that's sent to everyone Illinois recruits for football. One of its provisions is a "family concept" that asks team members to treat each other with "love and discipline." In case anyone misses the point, Mr. Tepper tells them it especially applies white-to-black and vice versa, and requires the lads to pledge to do that before they sign scholarship papers. The school has lost several recruits as a result. "I've had whites balk [at the pledge], but never a black," the coach notes.

Players quickly get the chance to prove their words. Seats at all team meetings are assigned on a black-white-black-white basis. Room assignments for summer practice before classes start, and for team road trips, are made the same way. The process is facilitated by the fact that the team is almost 50-50 white and black.

Thursday team dinners in season are designated as "Unity Nights," and players are encouraged to eat next to ones they don't know well. Players joke that this can mean that defensive players sit next to members of the offense, but the dinners also are occasions for interracial fraternizing.

Some of the ties fostered in those ways have flowered in others: Several whites and blacks on the team now are full-time roomies, and interracial team parties, the exception in pre-Tepper days, have become the rule.

Team members admit their white-black relationships are, mostly, no more than skin deep; "serious" racial issues, such as the O.J. Simpson trial, go undiscussed. "We like to keep things light," says Chris Koerwitz, an offensive lineman from Oshkosh, Wis. But while most of the Fighting Illini continue to take their ease with others of their race, it's with the knowledge that it could be otherwise.

"You might say I was prejudiced before. I knew very few black people, and accepted the negative things white people say about them," says Paul Marshall, a defensive lineman from almost-all-white Naperville, Ill. "Here, I've seen that the negatives aren't true, and that, given the chance, guys want to be friendly."

"Yeah, I signed coach's pledge, but I thought it was just recruiting stuff. Then I got here and, right away, I had this white guy for a roommate," says David James, a linebacker from almost-all-black East St. Louis, Ill. "It wasn't so bad," he smiles. "I played some rap for him and he played some Van Halen for me. We still do it sometimes."

AID FOR THE WORLD'S POOREST

• Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, one of the most shortsighted things we can do is to cut back on our foreign assistance, which is already far behind what other Western nations do in terms of the percentage of our budget and in terms of the percentage of our national income.

The New York Times had an excellent editorial titled, "Aid for the World's Poorest."

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD.

The editorial follows:

AID FOR THE WORLD'S POOREST

The new Republican majority in Congress wants to eliminate government services that private markets could also provide. Yet it has aimed its budget knife at a valuable program—economic aid to the world's poorest countries—that could not possibly survive without Federal funds. Drastic cuts approved by the House and Senate threaten to grind dreadfully poor people into deeper poverty.

Under President Bush's leadership, the United States committed itself to contributing about \$1.3 billion next year to the International Development Association, an affiliate of the World Bank that provides very-low-interest loans to poor countries. As part of its deficit reduction program, the House and Senate want to renege on that commitment and reduce the contribution to between \$577 million, the House figure, and \$775 million, the Senate's figure.

Neither figure makes fiscal or ethical sense. The I.D.A. loan program is cost-effective. Every dollar in American contributions leads to \$4 or \$5 more in contributions from other industrialized countries. To save a few hundred million out of a \$10 billion-plus foreign aid budget, Congress would trigger a \$3 billion reduction in I.D.A. loans.

The loan program is also politically effective. By inviting poor countries to open their economies to trade and adopt market reforms, I.D.A. loans are a cheap way for Congress to spread capitalism. The program's multilateral nature insulates recipient countries from pressures to warp their economic programs to suit the narrow export interests of individual donors. I.D.A. programs worked well in Korea, Thailand, Turkey and Indonesia. They are working well in Ghana and Bolivia.

Critics of the I.D.A. say that third-world countries would become more prosperous more rapidly if they relied more on private capital and far less on World Bank handouts. This criticism applied, at least until recently, to World Bank loans for dams and other infrastructure projects. As the new president of the World Bank concedes, private capital markets are willing and able to extend such loans. But private investors will not bail out sub-Saharan Africa and other economic disasters. Over 70 percent of private lending to developing nations goes to fewer than a dozen countries. Sub-Saharan Africa claims only 2 percent.

The I.D.A., not private capital, fights the spread of AIDS. The I.D.A. helps pay for schools. The I.D.A. finances women's health and childhood nutrition programs. The World Bank has shifted its priorities from investing in concrete to investing in people. No one else can take on this role. Do American taxpayers really prefer to save themselves about \$2 a year rather than leading the world to help those eking out an existence on less than \$2 a day?•

AFFIRMATIVE ACTION IS AS "AMERICAN AS THE CONSTITUTION"

• Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, as my colleagues know, I believe that affirmative action is a very good thing for our country; even though, like any good thing, it can be abused.

Prof. Steven Lubet of Northwestern University had an interesting article that points out that affirmative action is part of the U.S. Constitution.

My colleagues, who may be startled at that bit of information, will find the Steven Lubet article of interest.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

The article follows:

AFFIRMATIVE ACTION IS AS "AMERICAN AS THE CONSTITUTION"

(By Steven Lubet)

Opponents of affirmative action say the idea is contrary to basic American principles because it unfairly disadvantages blameless individuals, needlessly emphasizes group rights and enshrines an ethic of victimization. Affirmative action, they say, is a failed experiment from the despised '60s.

The real truth, however, is that affirmative action originated in the '80s. Not the 1980s, but the 1780s—1789, to be exact. Here is what the United States Constitution (Article I, Section 3) says about affirmative action: "The Senate of the United States shall be composed of two senators from each state." That's affirmative action—in fact, a quota system—for small states. There is no denying that the framers designed the Senate to protect group rights, notwithstanding any disadvantage to blameless individuals, and all on a theory of possible victimization. While any specific instance of affirmative action may be unnecessary or ill-advised, the concept has been with us from the beginning.

The size of a state's delegation in the House of Representatives is determined on the basis of population, in keeping with the democratic principles articulated in the Declaration of Independence. In the Senate, however, small states are given special treatment. They are afforded representation far out of proportion to population, to ensure that they will not be victimized, oppressed or subjected to discrimination by the majority.

There is no clearer example in our history of institutionalized group rights. Based upon accidents of birth and geography, the citizens of small states, such as Delaware and Maine, enjoyed the benefits of a quota system that made their political influence comparable to that of New York and Virginia, the giants of the time. In the 1990s, the same quota operates to the advantage of Alaska (one senator per 300,000 citizens) and to the detriment of California (one senator per 15,000,000 citizens). Is it unfair to count the vote of an Alaskan at 50 times the vote of an Californian? Sure it is, but we have become so inured to the Senate that it just seems natural.

That's our system. That's the way it works. And so it is; but it is also group-based affirmative action.

We are all familiar with the original arguments in favor of the Senate. One concern was that the interests of small states would not be respected in a Congress constituted strictly on the basis of population. Another consideration was the need to protect minorities (primarily meaning political minorities) from the temporary passions of transient majorities. And after more than 200 years, there is far-reaching agreement that the Senate has well served its intended functions. State-based affirmative action has worked according to plan.

So let's compare the establishment of the Senate to current programs of race-based affirmative action. To be sure, the parallel is inexact, but certain principles do overlap. In 1789, the small states feared the possibility of future discrimination under the newly-proposed Constitution. They were not willing to accept promises of benevolence or paternalism, but insisted on structural protection even at the cost of proportional democracy.

Today, racial minorities and women fear not only the hypothetical possibility of discrimination, but the persistence of a proven historical fact. They, too, decline to trust benign intentions and demand a structural